

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 20, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8 were pending, and rejected claims 1-8. Claims 2, 4-6 and 7 have been amended, claim 1 has been canceled, new claim 9 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 2-9 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Kiuchi. Page 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kiuchi and Greef.

Kiuchi discusses a system that groups records and performs totalization using a totalization definition table (see col. 3, lines 54-65). That is, to perform totalization the user must complete the totalization definition table.

The Examiner uses Greef to allegedly teach displaying information over plural computers.

The present invention, in some embodiments, allows a much simpler approach to be taken. The user does not need to complete a table but can select one of plural hierarchical structures, the data of the records of this selected structure are totalized, and then the selected structure and the total are displayed on the same display. In this way, the user can easily designate what needs to be totaled. And what is totaled along with the total is displayed for the user to easily confirm that what is desired to be totaled has actually been totaled. (See application figures 8-11). The prior art does not teach or suggest such.

It is submitted that the invention of independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 4 calls for totalization within groups (within the selected hierarchy), something not taught or suggested by the prior art. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New claim 9 emphasizes the use of a GUI to select what is to be totaled and then the display of what has been totaled and the total on the GUI. Nothing in the prior art teaches or

suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim, which is different and not narrower than prior filed claims distinguishes over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/22/15

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501